UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,014	06/20/2003	Avijit Chatterjee	ROC920030209US1	8483

46797   7590   12/07/2007
IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER
LIN, SHEW FEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/600,014	CHATTERJEE ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shew-Fen Lin	2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 September 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-4,12-24 and 26-28</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-4, 12-24, and 26-28</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

a. This action is taken to response to amendments filed on 9/20/2007and remarks filed on 6/28/07.

b. Claims 1-4, 12-24, and 26-28 are pending in this Office Action. Claims 1, 12, 18, and 21 are independent claims.

c. In view of the amendment to claims 1and 12, the Examiner hereby withdraws the pending 112 rejection that was given in the previous Office Action.

Claim Objections

Claim 12 recites the limitation, "*wherein the data object is identified by a set of identifying parameters.... wherein the selection is based, at least in part, on a set of identifying parameters identifying the data object to be annotated... creating an index based on the set of identifying parameters*". It is not clear if it is a new instance of "set of identifying parameters" or a reference to the original set of identifying parameters. If there are different sets of identifying parameters, please clarify which set is "the set of identifying parameters". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gupta et al. (US Patent 6,956,593, hereinafter "Gupta").

As to claim 12, Gupta discloses a method of creating annotations for a plurality of different type data objects manipulated by a plurality of applications (abstract, column 1, lines 63-67), comprising:

receiving a request from one of the applications to create an annotation for a data object, wherein the data object is identified by a set of identifying parameters (Figures 5-7, column 2, line 23-26, column 9, lines 26-34, column 11, lines 36-51, column 12, lines 56-59);

selecting an annotation structure from a set of annotation structures, each annotation structure defining one or more annotation fields (Figures 7-11, column 12, lines 44-46), wherein the selection is based, at least in part, on a set of identifying parameters identifying the data object to be annotated (Figure 7, column 11, lines 45-51, column 12, lines 60-64, column 13, lines 11-32);

generating a graphical user interface allowing entry of the one or more annotation fields (Figures 8-10, column 14, lines 58-65, column 15, lines 10-33);

creating an index based on the set of identifying parameters (unique annotation identifier,

Figure 4, item 194, column 9, lines 1-2); and

creating an annotation record comprising the index and information entered, via the

graphical user interface, for the one or more annotation fields (add annotation record through

GUI, Figures 4, 8-10, column 12, lines 56-59, column 14, lines 40-48).

As to claim 13, Gupta discloses further comprising storing the annotation record in an

annotation store separate from the annotated data object (annotation store, Figures 1 and 3,

column 7, lines 28-39).

As to claim 14, Gupta discloses wherein selecting the annotation structure comprises:

presenting, to a user, a plurality of annotation structures associated with the data object

. (Figures 7-11, column 12, lines 44-46); and

receiving, from the user, a selection of one of the plurality of annotation structures

(column 15, lines 13-24).

As to claim 15, Gupta discloses further comprising receiving, from the user, a selected

role in which the user has chosen to act (selection of annotation set to act, column 9, lines 15-25,

column 12, lines 65-67, column 13, lines 1-10).

As to claim 16, Gupta discloses wherein the plurality of annotation structures presented to the user is dependent on the selected role (read/write access control, column 9, lines 15-25, column 13, lines 1-10, column 16, lines 1-6).

As to claim 17, Gupta discloses further comprising generating a graphical user interface for displaying the annotation information, wherein the annotation information presented to the user in the graphical user interface is dependent on the selected role (Figure 12, column 16, lines 1-6).

As to claim 18, refer to "As to claim 12" and "As to claim 13" presented earlier in this Office Action.

As to claim 19, Gupta discloses wherein receiving a request from one of the applications to create an annotation for a data object comprises receiving the request from a plug-in annotation component (incorporated into the web browser, operating system, column 12, lines 3-13).

As to claim 20, Gupta discloses wherein selection of the annotation structure is based, at least in part, on one or more user credentials (read/write access control, column 9, lines 15-25, column 13, lines 1-10, column 16, lines 1-6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-4, 21-24, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Altman (US Pub 2004/0163042) in view of ESP (Electrical Schematics Page, April 25, 2002,

http://www.jlab.org/accel/inj_group/elec1.htm).

As to claim 1, Altman discloses a method for exchanging information between entities

on a network (Figure 5) comprising:

installing an annotation management system on the network (paragraph [0038], lines 3-5,

paragraph [0041], lines 17-19);

identifying a plurality of annotatable data objects (documents to be annotated, paragraph

[0003]) manipulated by a plurality of applications on the network (web browser, lotus note,

acrobat, Figure 5, paragraph [0041]), wherein the plurality of annotatable data objects comprise

at least one of electrical schematics and mechanical schematics; and

providing, via the annotation management system (annotation plug-in, paragraph [0041],

lines 6-11), one or more interfaces for manipulating annotations for the annotatable data objects

(create/modify through GUI, Figures 4A-C, paragraph [0040], 3-6, paragraph [0041], lines 6-11,

paragraph [0043], lines 11-14), a set of annotation structures each defining a set of annotation

fields (Figures 6, 13A, paragraph [0042], [0043],[0054]), and an annotation server configured to

receive requests to access annotations for one or more of the annotatable data objects issued by at

least one of the plurality of applications on the network (paragraph [0046]-[0047])), wherein, the

annotation server is further configured to generate, based on an annotation structure associated

with the one or more annotatable data objects, the one or more interfaces for creating or viewing

annotations (Figures 8A, 9A/B, paragraph [0051], [0054]).

Altman discloses that annotatable data objects can be a blueprint for architect or

professional engineer (paragraph [0048]) and does not explicitly disclose wherein the pluralities

of annotatable data objects comprise at least one of electrical schematics and mechanical

schematics.

ESP discloses annotatable data objects of electrical schematics in an Acrobat PDF format

(page 1).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention

was made to combine Altman and ESP teaching to annotate electrical schematics for the purpose

of documenting the modification and approval relating to the schematic diagrams. The skilled

artisan would have been motivated to improve the invention of Altman per the above by adding

annotation on electrical schematics diagrams such that workflow message can be generated and

reviewed (Abstract, Altman).

As to claim 2, Altman discloses wherein providing one or more interfaces comprises

providing at least one interface for creating annotations (Figures 9A, 9B, paragraph [0054]) and

at least one interface for viewing annotations (paragraph [0047]).

As to claim 3, Altman discloses wherein the one or more interfaces comprise at least one

graphical user interface (Figure 9B, paragraph [0047]).

As to claim 4, Altman discloses wherein the at least one graphical user interface is

accessible from within one or more of the applications (web browser, paragraph [0041], lines -

11).

As to claim 21, Altman discloses a system for managing annotations for one or more

different type data sources manipulated by a plurality of different type applications (Figure 5),

comprising:

an annotation database for storing annotations separately from the data sources

associated with the annotations (Abstract, Figures 3B, 4A, 4B, 4C, paragraph [0040], lines 3-6),

wherein the one or more different type data sources comprise at least one of electrical schematics and mechanical schematics;

a set of annotatable data object points defining portions of the data sources associated with the annotations described by the associated annotations (Figure 6, paragraph [0042]);

a set of annotation structures, each defining a set of annotation fields (Figures 6,13A, paragraph [0042], [0043],[0054]);

a set of plug-in components, each for interfacing between one or more applications and an annotation server (paragraph [0041]); and

an annotation server (annotation repository, abstract) configured to receive, via the plug-in components (annotation manager, paragraph [0041], lines 13-16), requests to access annotations for one or more of the annotatable data object points issued by the one or more of the applications running on the client computer (paragraph[0046]-[0047]) and generate a graphical user interface screen, based on an annotation structure associated with the one or more of the annotatable data object points, for creating or viewing annotations for the one or more annotatable data object points (Figures 8A, 9A/B, paragraph [0051], [0054]).

Altman discloses that annotatable data objects can be a blueprint for architect or professional engineer (paragraph [0048]) does not explicitly disclose wherein the one or more different type data sources comprise at least one of electrical schematics and mechanical schematics.

ESP discloses annotatable data source of electrical schematics in an Acrobat PDF format (page 1).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Altman and ESP teaching to annotate electrical schematics for the purpose of documenting the modification and approval relating to the schematic diagrams. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the invention of Altman per the above by adding annotation on electrical schematics diagrams such that workflow message can be generated and reviewed (Abstract, Altman).

As to claim 22, Altman discloses wherein the one or more different type data sources comprise at least text documents and database tables (paragraph [0009]).

As to claim 23, Altman discloses wherein the annotatable data object points comprise at least one or more database cells, and one or more portions of text documents (Figure 6, paragraph [0042]).

As to claim 24, Altman discloses wherein the one or more different type data sources further comprise at least multimedia files (combination of images and text, paragraph [0003], line 4) and the annotatable data object points comprise at least an image (paragraph [0043], lines 1-7).

As to claim 26, Altman discloses wherein the annotation server is configured to create annotations with no direct association to any of the annotatable data object points (paragraph [0043], lines 7-14).

As to claim 27, Altman discloses wherein the annotation server is configured to create

annotations associated with more than one of the data sources (scanned image, computer

generated files, database, paragraph [0009]).

As to claim 28, Altman discloses wherein the annotation server is configured to create

more than one annotation for a single annotatable data point (multiple reviews, Figure 8A,

paragraph [0051]).

Response to Amendment and Remarks

Applicant's amendments and remarks have been fully and carefully considered. In

response to these amendments, another iteration of claim analysis, based on previously relied on

references, and particularly addressing the newly amended limitation, has been made. Refer to

the corresponding sections of the claim analysis for details.

Response to remarks on 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections

Applicant argues that Gupta does not teach, "*...wherein the data object is identified by a*

set of identifying parameters.... wherein the selection is based, at least in part, on the [sic] set of

identifying parameters identifying the data object to be annotated". The Examiner respectfully

disagrees. First, applicant admits that a user could change the target of the annotation, such as by

typing in a new identifier in target area 300, i.e. data object is identified by identifier of the

media stream (see Gupta, column 13, lines 41-51, column 9, lines 26-28, media content identifier

field 200 contains data that uniquely identifies particular multimedia content as the content to

which annotation entry 180 corresponds). Furthermore, Gupta discloses that annotations

correspond to a temporal range of the media content (data object) as defined by a temporal

beginning point and a temporal ending point (a set of identifying parameters) (see Gupta, column

2, line 23-26). Second, Gupta teaches that selection of annotation structures are based on an

annotation type selector, such as text annotation, an audio annotation, or a uniform resource

locator (URL) annotation (Figure 7, 290, 292, 294) and begin/end points for annotation (Figure

7, 312, 314).

Response to remarks on 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections

Applicant argues that Altman does not teach, "*a set of annotation structures, each*

defining a set of annotation fields... wherein the annotation server is further configured to

generate, based on an annotation structure associated with the one or more annotatable data

objects". The Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, Altman teaches that each annotation

structure defining a set of annotation fields such as UID, Page_No, X_Pos, Y_Pos, Creator,.. (see

Figure 6). Furthermore, Altman discloses different annotation structures such as textual or

graphical annotation (see paragraph [0043]) and different annotation toolbar icons can be used to

insert annotation [each icons will create different annotation structures to position the annotation,

either x_pos, y_pos or an additional coordinate pair to specify the bound of the annotation], for

example, "draw a rectangle", "highlight text or graphics" or "strikeout text or graphics" (see

Figure 9A, paragraph [0042],[0054]). Second, Altman teaches wherein the annotation server is

further configured to generate, based on an annotation structure associated with the one or more

annotatable data objects (see paragraph [0051], [0054], FIG. 8A is a screen capture showing an exemplary user interface for selecting at least one review of a set of reviews accessible by a user, also illustrated is a text annotation 925. By selecting that annotation (e.g., by double clicking on it), the text of the annotation is brought up (e.g., in a dialog box as shown in FIG. 9B)).

Applicant argues that Altman is silent as to any different types of interface depending on a type of data object being annotated. It is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., different types of interface depending on a type of data object being annotated) is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In this case, one interface will meet the requirement of "one or more interface".

Applicant argues that ESP is silent as to annotating an electrical or mechanical schematic. The examiner respectfully submits that Altman teaches that the annotatable data objects could be any PDF files such as a blueprint for architect or professional engineer (paragraph [0048]) which implicitly teaches that data object comprise an electrical or mechanical schematic. Furthermore, ESP discloses electrical schematics in an Acrobat PDF format, the combination of Altman and ESP explicitly teach the annotatable data objects comprise an electrical or mechanical schematic.

For the above reasons, the Examiner's stance regarding the status of claims remains the same as stated in the previous Office Action.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office

Action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the

extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Shew-Fen Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-2672. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Any inquiry of a

general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the

receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Shew-Fen Lin
Patent Examiner
December 4, 2007   Art Unit 2166

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER